

**LYNNWOOD PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**April 5, 2017**

10. Call to Order – 6:56 pm.

20. Roll Call

Boardmember Aldrich	Councilmember Ross
Boardmember Dews	Director Sordel
Boardmember Hildebrandt	Park Superintendent Peterson
Boardmember O'Connor	Project Manager Barnett
Boardmember Thompson	Administrative Assistant Flesher

30. Approval of Minutes – February 1, 2017. Approved.

40. Written Communications – None.

50. Public Comments – None.

60. Comments from Boardmembers:

Boardmember Aldrich expressed that he is anxious to hear about the status of park impact fees.

Boardmember O'Connor reported that he is excited to finally be an official member of the Board. He reported visiting the off-leash dog area frequently and indicated that it is very popular and very muddy. Director Sordel noted that it had been an exceptionally wet and cold winter, which made it very challenging to maintain the turf. Park Superintendent Peterson reported that the site doubles as an underground storage vault, which prohibits the use of wood chips on the surface. It would contaminate the soils and limit accessibility to the vault. Staff is investigation other alternatives to help improve conditions. Councilmember Ross suggested posting a notice at the park with that information.

Boardmember Thompson mentioned Bio Clean, a Forterra company with an alternative water filtration system of modular wetlands. This system is more efficient and requires less maintenance; quite a few municipalities are turning to this type of solution instead of Filterra. Park Superintendent Peterson asked about the cost; Boardmember Thompson indicated that the cost is comparable.

Boardmember Hildebrandt encouraged Boardmembers to attend the Volunteer Recognition event on April 26.

70. Resolutions and Other Business.

70.1 Recreation Center Parking Lot Update. Director Sordel reported that lack of parking is the number one complaint at the Recreation Center as registrations and revenues continue to increase Construction is anticipated to begin in spring 2018 and be complete before summer programs begin.

Director Sordel introduced Project Manager Barnett, who explained the current cost estimate for the project. The estimated cost to add 35 spaces is \$800,000, in large part due to water detention costs. The soils are impermeable and a large vault is required. This cost was not expected by staff, who are now seeking alternatives make the project more cost effective. One option is to remove the large sequoia tree, which could add 12 more spaces. Park Superintendent Peterson reported that another thought is to gain more benefit for the cost by including new plantings and amenities for the Mesika Trail, as well as a formalized trailhead location. A dry riverbed or pond adjacent to the trail could also help offset the water detention needs. Project Manager Barnett asked the Board for its ideas and thoughts regarding potential options moving forward.

Boardmember Aldrich asked if the project qualified for the 1% for the Arts? Project Manager Barnett responded that it did.

Boardmember Hildebrandt asked if moving the water detention to the Mesika Trail would that affect the neighbors on the other side? Project Manager Barnett responded that any design would ensure that this wouldn't happen.

Project Manager Barnett noted that the designer would strive to keep the cedar trees and potentially remove the alders.

Boardmember Thompson suggested using water detention on the Mesika Trail as an opportunity to have a "water feature" to offer interest.

Boardmember Aldrich asked if there was a downside to removing the tree. Project Manager Barnett responded that saving the tree would make for an extremely expensive project and an ineffective use of City funds that wouldn't needs of the Recreation Center.

Boardmember Thompson summarized: a potential solution is to "kill two birds with one stone" and get more spaces while also using the Mesika Trail enhancements as mitigation for the tree and as storm water treatment; we also could potentially save the tree and move the vault; we could remove the tree and not move the vault; or we could do something entirely different.

Boardmember Thompson asked what had driven saving the tree in the initial plan. Project Manager Barnett indicated that it was talked about during the property purchase but is not required as part of the purchase documents. It has been previously discussed with the Mayor and City Council that staff would attempt to save the tree. Park Superintendent Peterson noted that saving trees is always one of his top priorities, but evaluating the feasibility, the cost and the need has caused staff to look at other possibilities.

Boardmember O'Connor suggested that removing the tree provides an opportunity for 12 more families to use the Recreation Center. He likes the idea of using a pond on the trail as mitigation for removing the tree. He asked if someone might be able to apply to label the tree a heritage tree. Project Manager Barnett

indicated that Jared Bond in Public Works said it doesn't meet the criteria, but he will be involved throughout the process.

Boardmember Hildebrandt asked if there might be any changes to the campus happening in the next several years that should be taken into consideration? Director Sordel replied that there is nothing on the horizon.

Project Manager Barnett indicated that staff didn't want to give the consultant a final list of options until meeting with the Board. He suggested the three options as discussed:

1. Remove the tree and do a drainage basin.
2. Remove the tree and do a dry riverbed with other Mesika trail enhancements.
3. Combination – use the parking lot for some detention and use drainage basin or dry riverbed for the rest, either leaving or tree or removing the tree. With this option, there would be potential for flooding of part of the parking lot during heavy water events.

Project Manager Barnett indicated that staff had the consultant look at rest of campus to see if a drainage basin could be moved into a different location. All other areas are too high.

Boardmember Thompson suggested thorough documentation should the tree be removed. She noted that it might be helpful to know what internal energy was geared toward saving the tree. She expressed that she likes the idea of getting more public benefit and is an advocate of taking out the tree for this reason. She would be interested to know how many additional trees would need to be removed with any potential improvements to the Mesika Trail.

Boardmember Hildebrandt suggested visiting the site during the next meeting as part of the continued discussion.

Boardmember Thompson noted that Park Superintendent Peterson and his crew do a fantastic job maintaining the trail and keeping it safe and attractive.

- 70.2 Interurban Trail Master Plan Update. Boardmember Thompson reported that she works for HBB Landscape Architecture. Since joining the Board, she had been waiting for an opportunity to use her background to help the City with a cool and fun project. HBB's president didn't even question allowing her to help with master planning on this section of the interurban Trail. She indicated that she first met with City staff to familiarize HBB with the trail and learn about its history and potential opportunities and constraints: safety and security issues, connectivity deficiencies, lack of adequate support facilities and need for additional amenities. She also learned about the character of the trail and its different sections.

A charrette was then held with the community, at which small groups discussed different segments of the trail, existing and desired activities and potential projects needed to fulfill the master plan. She noted that the City has a desire to focus on improving wayfinding to the trail and also from the trail to local

businesses. The City, in partnership with Experience Momentum, has some resources to improve the 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue trailhead in City Center. The City Center master plan already addresses design standards as well as standards for many of the site furnishings, so much of the work had already been done by the City.

Boardmember Thompson presented a conceptual plan for the 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue trailhead. She described the location and the specific needs for this section of the trail. Elements of the plan include some sort of shelter as an icon or beacon. There is an art element already installed with the wrapped utility boxes. The plan also includes a seat wall, edible plantings and picnic tables. There is also a need in this location for some fitness elements or features since this is the fitness section of the trail. She noted that some manufacturers make fitness features that look more sculptural. There is also an open space nearby that allows for some informal fitness or seating, and a grade change so there could be a loop trail for physical therapy. With a wide enough path, it could even allow for some integrated skate features.

Boardmember Dews asked if the plan was ADA compliant. Boardmember Thompson responded that the trail would be compliant but not all paths have to be compliant. Boardmember Dews suggested signage highlight areas that are not compliant to warn users with wheelchairs or walkers so that they don't get stuck in such a section.

Boardmember Dews also cautioned that a partnership with the business owner should be clearly defines to avoid issues regarding expectations for future use. Park Superintendent indicated that the City will execute a formal easement from the property owner so there will be a written agreement. Boardmember Dews urged staff to ensure the agreement covers liability issues. Park Superintendent Peterson reported that this business has adopted this portion of the trail and will be doing some restoration there as an Earth Day project. The drinking fountain will also tie into property owner's water line. Boardmember Dews noted that the quality of the water should be covered in the agreement.

Boardmember Thompson noted that, as the agreement is formalized, the final planning can take place and some features might be adjusted.

Boardmember Aldrich asked if the City has an indefinite easement with the PUD. Director Sordel indicated that the City is currently negotiating for a new 25-year agreement.

Director Sordel thanked Boardmember Thompson and HBB for their work on this project.

## 80. Staff Reports.

- 80.1 Tree City USA Report/Arbor Day. A report was provided and discussed. Boardmembers are invited to attend the Arbor Day celebration on April 28 at 9:45am at Lynndale Park.

- 80.2 New Board/Commission Ordinance. A report was provided and discussed. The major change is the implementation of a two-term limit.
- 80.3 Staff Report. A staff report was provided and discussed.
- The Board discussed the upcoming Park Impact Fee study to be performed by the Trust for Public Land.
- Boardmember Hildebrandt thanked staff for including the capital projects matrix.
- The Board agreed to reschedule its July meeting to July 12 and begin at 6:30pm for the annual tour of parks.
90. Messages from the City Council. Councilmember Ross encouraged Boardmembers to attend the volunteer event recognition event. She also announced that the Council will hold its first Town Meeting at Cedar Valley School at 7:00pm on May 17. The focus of the meeting will be to discuss what it means to be a safe and welcoming City and to review the original City visioning document.
100. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.